

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/681,711	10/07/2003	Stephen L. Crooks	57070US038	5874	
32692 7590 . 05/14/2004			EXAMINER		
3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY			HUANG, EV	HUANG, EVELYN MEI	
PO BOX 33427 ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1625		

DATE MAILED: 05/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/681,711	CROOKS ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Evelyn Huang	1625				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a ree - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the maili earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day It will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te. cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	is action is non-final.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 28 and 29 is/are pending in the apple 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdress. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 28 and 29 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examir	er.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bures * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicati ority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
A44k4(-)	· ·					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Practices Cried (170-032) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da					

Application/Control Number: 10/681,711

Art Unit: 1625

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 28-29 are pending. Claims 1-27 have been canceled according to the preliminary amendment filed on 10-7-2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 28, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. ***.

a. Nature of the invention.

The instant invention is drawn to an arylether substituted imidazoquinoline for treating a neoplastic disease.

b. State of the prior art and the level of the skill in the art.

Imidazo[4,5-c]quinolin-4-amine derivatives are known (Gerster I, 5266575, PTO-1449, columns 9-10). Certain imidazo[4,5-c] quinoline compounds have been shown to induce TNF and IL-1 production (Testerman, PTO-1449, abstract). Although interferon alpha has been implicated in many diseases, including neoplastic diseases, a nexus between the induction of interferon biosynthesis and the treatment of these diseases has not been fully established. Furthermore, at present there is no known umbrella drug that can treat any type of neoplastic diseases, since the different neoplastic diseases are of different origins, have different cellular mechanisms and consequently, would require different treatment protocols.

The level of the skill in the anticancer art is high.

c. Predictability/unpredictability of the art.

Application/Control Number: 10/681,711

Art Unit: 1625

The high degree of unpredictability is well-recognized in the anticancer art. For example, some drugs known to be effective against small cell lung cancer are inactive in melanoma (Sof ina et al. Experimental Evaluation of Antitumor Drugs in the USA and USSR and Clinical Correlations. NCI Monograph 55. NIH Publication No. 80-1933 (1980), page 77). The 1, 3-cyclohexanediones shown to be active in test against human sarcoma is found to be inactive against other types of cancer such as leukemia, lymphosarcoma etc. (Strandtmann, J. Med. Chem. (1967), 10(6):1063-1065). Correlation between the anti-tumor drugs in experimental system and in patient treatment is incomplete (Sof ina, page 76). Furthermore, it is known that a slight change in the structure of the compound would drastically change its biological activity as evidenced in the very different ED₅₀ values for the structurally similar compounds (Strandtmann, page 1065, Table II). One of ordinary skill in the art therefore would have little basis to extrapolate the data from one set of compounds to other structurally dissimilar compounds.

d. Amount of guidance/working examples.

The preparation of example compounds has been described. The ability of the example compounds to induce interferon and TNF in human blood cells is shown in the specification. The procedures for assessment of anti-neoplastic activity are not described. No in vivo procedures are described.

e. Breadth of the claims.

Applicant's assertion that all the structurally diverse compounds, including those having aryl, heteroaryl, heteroaryl, further substituted with optionally substituted aryl, heteroaryl, heterocyclyl, are effective in treating any or all neoplastic diseases does not commensurate with the scope of the objective enablement, especially in view of the high degree of unpredictability in the anti-cancer art, the working examples limiting to induction of interferon alpha and TNF, and the fact that at present there is no known umbrella drug effective for treating all types of neoplastic diseases (paragraphs c, d above).

f. Quantitation of undue experimentation.

Since insufficient guidance and teaching have been provided by the specification (paragraphs c-e above), one of ordinary skill in the art, even with high level of skill, is unable to use the instant compound as claimed without undue experimentation.

Application/Control Number: 10/681,711 Page 4

Art Unit: 1625

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 28, 29 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 26, 28 of U. S. Patent No. 6664265.

The patented method comprising administering the patented compound to the animal having a neoplastic disease is encompassed by the instant method of treating a neoplastic disease with the same compound.

5. Claims 28, 29 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 24, 26 of U. S. Patent No. 6660747.

The patented method comprising administering the patented compound (wherein n=0-4) to the animal having a neoplastic disease is obvious over the instant method of treating a neoplastic disease with the inventive compound (wherein n=0), since the compounds wherein n=0 are preferred compounds which are exemplified in the patent.

6. Claims 28, 29 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 25, 26 of copending Application No. 10/681457.

Art Unit: 1625

The copending methods for treating a neoplastic disease comprising administering to an animal in need thereof, the compound of formula I or II wherein n=0-4 is obvious over the instant method wherein n=0, since the compounds wherein n=0 are preferred compounds which are exemplified in the copending application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

- 7. No claims are allowed.
- Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the 8. examiner should be directed to Evelyn Huang whose telephone number is 571-272-0686. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph McKane can be reached on 571-272-0699. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Evelyn Huang
Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1625